|    | Page 1                         |
|----|--------------------------------|
| 1  | UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT |
| 2  | SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK  |
| 3  | Case No. 23-10063-shl          |
| 4  | x                              |
| 5  | In the Matter of:              |
| 6  |                                |
| 7  | GENESIS GLOBAL HOLDCO, LLC,    |
| 8  |                                |
| 9  | Debtor.                        |
| 10 | x                              |
| 11 |                                |
| 12 | United States Bankruptcy Court |
| 13 | 300 Quarropas Street, Room 248 |
| 14 | White Plains, NY 10601         |
| 15 |                                |
| 16 | July 20, 2023                  |
| 17 | 2:12 PM                        |
| 18 |                                |
| 19 |                                |
| 20 |                                |
| 21 | BEFORE:                        |
| 22 | HON SEAN H. LANE               |
| 23 | U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE          |
| 24 |                                |
| 25 | ECRO: ALIANNA AND ART          |

Page 2 1 HEARING re Omnibus Hearing. 2 3 HEARING re Doc. #514 Notice Of Agenda. 4 5 HEARING re Scheduling Conference Re: Fee Application; Claim 6 Objections; Disclosure Statement. 7 8 HEARING re Doc. #483 Motion To Amend The Order Authorizing 9 The Debtors To Retain And Compensate Certain Professionals 10 Utilized In The Ordinary Course Of Business. 11 12 HEARING re Doc. #289 Motion For Relief From The Automatic 13 Stay Re: FTX Trading. 14 15 HEARING re Doc. #373 Motion To Authorize / Motion To 16 Establish Procedures And A Schedule For Estimating The 17 Amount Of The FTX Debtors Claims Against The Debtors Under 18 Bankruptcy Code Sections 105(a) And 502(c) And Bankruptcy 19 Rule 3018. 20 21 22 23 24 25 Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

|    | Page 3   |
|----|--|
| 1  | APPEARANCES:                                   |
| 2  |  |
| 3  | CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN HAMILTON LLP             |
| 4  | Attorneys for Debtors                          |
| 5  | One Liberty Plaza                              |
| 6  | New York, NY 10006                             |
| 7  |  |
| 8  | BY: JANE VANLARE (TELEPHONICALLY)              |
| 9  | LUKE BAREFOOT (TELEPHONICALLY)                 |
| 10 | DEANDRA FIKE (TELEPHONICALLY)                  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 | WHITE CASE LLP                                 |
| 13 | Attorneys for Committee of Unsecured Creditors |
| 14 | 1221 Avenue of The Americas                    |
| 15 | New York, NY 10020                             |
| 16 |  |
| 17 | BY: J. CHRISTOPHER SHORE (TELEPHONICALLY)      |
| 18 |  |
| 19 | PROSKAUER ROSE LLP                             |
| 20 | Attorneys for Ad Hoc Committee                 |
| 21 | Eleven Times Square                            |
| 22 | New York, NY 10036                             |
| 23 |  |
| 24 | BY: MEGAN VOLIN (TELEPHONICALLY)               |
| 25 |  |

|    |      | Page 4  |
|----|------|---|
| 1  | SULL | IVAN CROMWELL                                       |
| 2  |      | Attorneys for FTX Debtors                           |
| 3  |      | 125 Broad Street                                    |
| 4  |      | New York, NY 10004                                  |
| 5  |      |   |
| 6  | BY:  | ANDREW DIETDERICH (TELEPHONICALLY)                  |
| 7  |      | BRIAN GLUECKSTEIN (TELEPHONICALLY)                  |
| 8  |      | BEN BELLER (TELEPHONICALLY)                         |
| 9  |      |   |
| 10 | PAUL | HASTINGS  |
| 11 |      | Attorneys for FTX Unofficial Committee of Unsecured |
| 12 |      | Creditors   |
| 13 |      | 200 Park Avenue                                     |
| 14 |      | New York, NY 10016                                  |
| 15 |      |   |
| 16 | BY:  | KENNETH PASQUALE (TELEPHONICALLY)                   |
| 17 |      |   |
| 18 | WEIL | GOTSHAL MANGES LLP                                  |
| 19 |      | Attorneys for Digital Currency Group                |
| 20 |      | 767 Fifth Avenue                                    |
| 21 |      | New York, NY 10153                                  |
| 22 |      |   |
| 23 | BY:  | FURQAAN SIDDIQUI (TELEPHONICALLY)                   |
| 24 |      |   |
| 25 |      |   |

|    | Page 5                                |
|----|---------------------------------------|
| 1  | HUGHES HUBBARD & REED, LLP            |
| 2  | Attorneys for Gemini Trust Company    |
| 3  | 1 Battery Park Plaza                  |
| 4  | New York, NY 10004                    |
| 5  |                                       |
| 6  | BY: JEFFREY MARGOLIN (TELEPHONICALLY) |
| 7  |                                       |
| 8  |                                       |
| 9  |                                       |
| 10 |                                       |
| 11 |                                       |
| 12 |                                       |
| 13 |                                       |
| 14 |                                       |
| 15 |                                       |
| 16 |                                       |
| 17 |                                       |
| 18 |                                       |
| 19 |                                       |
| 20 |                                       |
| 21 |                                       |
| 22 |                                       |
| 23 |                                       |
| 24 |                                       |
| 25 |                                       |

Page 6 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Good afternoon. This is Judge Sean Lane in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern 3 District of New York and we're here for a two o'clock 4 5 hearing in Genesis Global Holdco, a Chapter 11 case. And so, we'll start this hearing as we always do with 7 appearances. So let me find out who's here on behalf of the 8 Debtor. 9 MS. VANLARE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jane 10 VanLare, Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton on behalf of the 11 Debtors. THE COURT: Right. On behalf of the Official 12 13 Committee of Unsecured Creditors? 14 MR. SHORE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Chris 15 Shore from White & Case on behalf of the UCC. 16 THE COURT: All right, good afternoon, and on 17 behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee? 18 MS. VOLIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Megan Volin, Proskauer Rose, on behalf of the Ad Hoc Group. 19 20 THE COURT: All right, good afternoon. On behalf 21 of the Debtors in the FTX case? 22 MR. DIETDERICH: Good afternoon. Andy Dietderich, Brian Glueckstein, and Ben Beller, Sullivan and Cromwell. 23 24 THE COURT: All right, good afternoon. And I 25 believe there's an Unofficial Committee of Unsecured

Pg 7 of 24 Page 7 1 Creditors for FTX, there a counsel here for that group. 2 MR. PASOUALE: Yes, Your Honor, good afternoon. For the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors in the FTX 3 4 case, Ken Pasquale from Paul Hastings. 5 THE COURT: All right, good afternoon. And as is 6 usual, or maybe -- oh, Digital Currency Group. Let me see 7 if there's anyone here for Digital Currency Group. 8 MR. SIDDIQUI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 9 Furgaan Siddiqui at Weil Gotshal & Manges on behalf of 10 Digital Currency Group. 11 THE COURT: All right, good afternoon. So let me 12 find out if there's anyone else here who wishes to make an 13 appearance as they anticipate speaking at today's hearing. 14 MR. MARGOLIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 15 Jeffrey Margolin, Hughes Hubbard & Reed on behalf of Gemini 16 Trust Company. 17 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. Anyone 18 else? All right, good afternoon to you all. So I have a 19 copy of the agenda which is at Docket 514 that sets forth a 20 number of different things and a couple of which are 21 conversations that are continuations of conversations that 22 we've had in the past in other hearings, and as I think we 23 discussed at those hearings, my intention wasn't to reargue

those today but rather to talk about any subsequent

developments and see where we are.

24

But the motions were very ably argued previously and that's, particularly the lift stay motion that's at Item No. 2 on the docket and the estimation motion. And so -but I know we have an ordinary course motion which is at docket -- listed at No. 1 on the agenda. So with all that as prologue, let me turn it over to Debtors' counsel to walk us through what we need to address here today. MS. VANLARE: Thank you, Your Honor. VanLare, Cleary Gottlieb. And also, on behalf of the Debtors in the courtroom we have Mr. Luke Barefoot and our colleague, Ms. Deandra Fike. THE COURT: All right, and I would just say, Counsel, I'm having a little trouble hearing you. I can make it out, but it's sort of at the very fringes of what I can make out, so we'll just monitor it and hope that that's -- doesn't become an issue. MS. VANLARE: Thank you, Your Honor. Just let me know. It may be an issue --THE COURT: Yep. You just -- in fact, it's almost as if on cue, you just dropped off and perhaps it's a me problem. I don't know if folks elsewhere are having trouble hearing. MR. DIETDERICH: We have the same difficulty, Your Honor. All right. THE COURT: That's one of the joys of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Pg 9 of 24 Page 9 this era of practicing law is you never quite know. the Court went blank the other day, I went blank for about 15 seconds and it was clearly on us, so I never quite know. So, Ms. VanLare, it might be advisable, if you have an alternative way to be heard, I'm happy to take a brief moment for you to do that. MS. VANLARE: Your Honor, if you can hear me, why don't I pass the microphone over to Ms. Fike to present the ordinary course motion and in the meantime, I will dial up. THE COURT: Perfect. Sounds eminently sensible. All right. So turning to the ordinary course motion, Counsel? MS. FIKE: Yes, Your Honor. Good afternoon. This is Deandra Fike speaking, of Cleary Gottlieb, on behalf of the Debtor. Let me know if you can hear me okay. THE COURT: I can hear you just fine. Thank you. MS. FIKE: Great. I will be presenting Item 1 on the agenda, the Debtors' motion to amend the author order -the order authorizing the Debtors to retain and compensate certain professionals utilized in the ordinary course of business, which should be tab one of Your Honor's binder and is located at the Docket No. 483. As Your Honor will recall, the Debtors previously filed the application to

employ professionals used in the ordinary course of business

at Docket No. 65 on February 8th of this year, which was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

subsequently entered by this Court at Docket No. 102 on February 24th also of this year.

The Debtors are now moving to amend such order to first increase the OCP monthly cap set forth in the OCP order from \$100,000 per month to \$150,000 per month on a three-month rolling average, and secondly, to increase the overall OCP case cap from \$300,000 to \$500,000.

The Debtors believe such increases to be in the best interests of the Debtors' estates, their creditors, and other parties in interest, as it will allow the professionals to continue efficiently providing their critical services without having to continually expend additional time and incur additional cost related to the preparation of full retention and fee applications and statements.

Further, such increases are in line with more realistic amounts routinely approved for professionals in cases of similar duration and complexity, as further outlined in the motion to amend. The Debtors consulted with the Office of the U.S. Trustee, counsel for the Committee, and counsel for Gemini prior to filing the motion to amend, none of which had any objection to the motion.

The motion is now before Your Honor uncontested.

And with that, unless Your Honor has any questions, the

Debtors respectfully request that Your Honor approve the

Page 11 1 motion and enter an order substantiating the form of the 2 proposed order filed as Exhibit A to the motion to amend. THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. 3 4 there any party that wishes to be heard in connection with 5 the motion? All right, hearing no responses and noting as 6 was just represented that the U.S. Trustee's Office, the 7 Committee, and counsel for Gemini Trust Company, in fact, 8 had no objection to the relief requested, I'm happy to grant 9 the relief. I do know that it is consistent with the cap 10 set in other cases. 11 We obviously do that on a going forward basis and 12 it's perfectly fine, appropriate, and indeed understandable to start out with a lower number and then seek leave to make 13 14 -- to change those numbers on the fly as you go, but these 15 numbers are consistent with the cases you identify in 16 Paragraph 11 of your motion and I'm happy to approve it as 17 being a good idea for these cases and appropriate under all 18 the facts and circumstances. So, that motion is approved. 19 Thank you very much, Counsel. 20 MS. FIKE: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll pass the 21 virtual podium. 22 THE COURT: All right. MS. VANLARE: Your Honor, hello again. 23 Is this 24 better?

That is much better. Thank you very

THE COURT:

much.

MS. VANLARE: Excellent. Thank you for your patience. Appreciate it. So next on the agenda, Your Honor, are the two FTX related motions, the motion of the FTX debtors to lift the stay and our motion for estimation. As Your Honor noted, I think this was intended as a status conference. We have been continuing to exchange information. We have had some meet and confers on -- relating to discovery and the issues.

Your Honor, what I would propose in terms of next steps, we have had some discussions on the issues that we would propose to be -- that would be the basis for the estimation motion. I think the FTX debtors have different views, and -- as I'm sure won't be surprising. So, what I would propose on our side, what I think would be helpful is if we had an opportunity to submit a letter brief on the issues that we think are the ones that should go forward and a proposed schedule and we would invite, counsel to the FTX debtors to do the same.

And then we would ask Your Honor to hold another status conference, in which you could sort of take a look at the issues and the schedule and then we could have a more concrete discussion. And we would ask that we proceed with that next week, obviously subject to Your Honor's availability, but we think it would be helpful to have the

letter briefs that I just described with the issues on file on Tuesday and then a conference with Your Honor perhaps later that week. I know we previously had time on Thursday. I don't know if that time is available, but it would be subject to Your Honor's availability.

one minute, obviously, but I was thinking about these issues the other day and realized that when I was checking my notes that you had made a comment and I think it was in connection with the -- that Exhibit B which had the potential defenses to preference claims. And when you were describing things you mentioned at one point that there were some things that you -- if I remember it correctly, that you thought were some purely legal issues, right? There's -- there wasn't a whole lot of factual dispute, but rather there were particular legal issues.

The reason -- and when I thought about that a little bit further, it occurred to me that there -- what estimation really is designed to do particularly or what it's particularly good at is getting a handle on a very unwieldy factual record, saying Judge, it's going to take a long time to figure that out and we want to essentially provide you with a smaller version of that where you can get a sense of what the facts are and then make an estimate of what you think is appropriate.

It occurs to me that for the things that maybe fall either exclusively or much closer to the solely legal issue, depending on the schedule in the case, you know, lots of people ask for things expedited and they're not estimations, but they're gating issues for something, either confirmation, distribution, whatever it is; that it may be that there are some issues that are simply amenable being put on an expedited track to decide on the merits.

And the reason why I mentioned that is because estimation, while it can be beneficial, it can also be a bit of an albatross, meaning that as you go forward everybody has this this other uncertainty that whatever the outcome, the other side will say estimation was done improperly and you raise a whole other set of collateral issues.

And regardless of who wins or loses, what we all want to do is to do this in the most efficient way so that you don't have a lot of collateral issues. We -- you present me the issues that need to be decided that are central and when I decide them, unless you resolve them.

So, I don't have a -- when I'm going through the list and my notes of prior conversations, I didn't have any magic application of this thought to the list you had, but I wanted to throw it out for the consideration of the Debtors and FTX that there may be some ones that you just say, well, jeez, we were going to get so close anyway, we might as well

just tee this up on the merits and maybe there's some particular merit things that we just -- Judge, we just need quick answers on these.

That's fine. That happens. And that for ones that might have -- then you could really think about estimation more as ones that have more unwieldy and extensive factual -- potential factual records that, where an estimation does give you and is sort of in the classic estimation wheelhouse of shortening procedures and shortening time and getting you decisions.

And so, I throw that out there for your consideration as you have your discussions and you think about what makes sense.

MS. VANLARE: Appreciate that very much, Your Honor. We'll certainly take that into account as we consider what our revised proposed schedule should look like and see if we want to modify our proposal based on that quidance.

THE COURT: All right. And with that, I'll turn it over to Mr. Dietderich and other folks in the room where he sits, whoever wants to jump in on your thoughts about next steps.

MR. DIETDERICH: Thank you, Your Honor. For the record, Andy Dietderich, Sullivan & Cromwell. Your Honor, we were not consulted with this proposal to submit letter

briefs to Your Honor. It would have been easy to have that discussion with us before the hearing today, but it strikes us as news today. We would be happy to talk about that kind of a process. We probably need more time than Tuesday to submit that, just because of the work streams that we're managing here.

Again, it takes us by surprise. But we're perfectly fine with submitting to Your Honor something organized and in writing about a path forward, what issues should be potentially resolved by Your Honor, what issues should be resolved by Judge Dorsey in Delaware, and to lay that out, and if there's a distinction to make a sensible distinction between legal issues and factual issues, you know, we can do that in the same submission.

I do think, I do think, Your Honor, that under your guidance a little bit, we have made real progress on a number of fronts here. We know a lot more about the Genesis case than we did when we started. It's still a little bit of a black box to us, but we do know more. We still continue to believe that part of this process should be finding a way to not impede it and to make sure that whatever we're doing on the resolution of this issue can kind of have our cake and eat it too in terms of being -- not touching it in issues that are central to FTX but also not slowing down the Genesis case.

So, we're very committed to that project and we are -- have made some progress, as Ms. VanLare mentioned, in identifying what is in dispute. We did send a list of issues, kind of the FTX specific issues, our sacred issues, if you will, for the FTX case. We did sent that across to Ms. VanLare on Friday. We don't have a detailed response from her yet, but we will look at that again and make that the heart of our submission to Your Honor next week. So, we're fine, but we would ask to maybe do that at the end of next week rather than Tuesday if that's all right.

THE COURT: Well, let me -- so I can help you on the schedule. I'm at a Federal Judicial Center conference Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, so my thought would be let's sort of split the baby, have submissions due on Thursday and then commit to having a get-together the following week to talk about things. And what that will also do is allow you to get a chance to look at each other's submissions and see if you can further narrow the gap. I'm always happy to have updates that say, Judge, we submitted something that raises a whole bunch of potential flashpoints and we've resolved some of those, and even if we need your guidance on others.

So, I know that there was -- and this was no doubt going to be on everybody's agenda anyway -- discussions about further proceedings and I think the thought was in the aftermath of various conversations the other day to move the

disclosure statement hearing and I believe that chambers -and there's conversations back and forth and I think you
landed on August 4th as a date, so I would say we could
potentially use that date as a time to chat.

I'm happy if we need to chat earlier and so I'm,

I'm happy if we want to stick in another date, if -- a

little earlier than that, if that would be helpful, but

certainly we wouldn't go past August 4th in terms of having

a date to talk. So, what I might do is if you give me a

second, I can check. Got several calendars here and I need

to check one I have that's not in front of me.

Maybe I'll give you -- we'll use August 4th as the date, but I'll give you an earlier date as well. And if you're still talking and making progress, you'll just tell me we're going to do it in August 4th, but I'll be available to have a conversation if I can be of any use, and you all are much closer to these issues. I'm not part of the negotiations. So, you're in a much better position to let me know if getting together is -- whether it's the right time to do that.

If you're stuck, then the answer is yeah, fine; but if you're still making progress, you can just release the date. You just give chambers a call and let us know that. So if you give me one second.

And so, what I could do is schedule something for,

perhaps for Wednesday morning, August 2nd, say Wednesday,
August 2nd at ten o'clock or eleven o'clock, whatever works
for folks, or the afternoon as well. And if you're still
working, you just call me and release the date and if -- but
if it's helpful to chat then, we can chat then.

MS. VANLARE: Thank you, Your Honor. I think that makes sense. I would note also, I was not envisioning something much more extensive than the chart that you had looked at previously and that Mr. Dietderich just referenced as far as what their views are. So I -- that was why I thought that we didn't really need that much more time but, but happy to use extra time. I'm just -- I just wanted to specify it so that we don't have a differing understanding of what Your Honor will receive next Thursday in terms of length and --

THE COURT: Yeah, I think anything that's submitted would contain -- the issue would contain a sort of summary of what you think resolution of that issues would entail, whether it would include witness testimony or it's a pure legal issue. If it does include witness testimony, to what extent is it the proposal to have two witnesses a side, is it half a day, a full day, three days?

And whether to inject the last comment into this, whether it's something that really would be the subject of estimation or really just something that would be a

decision. Again, so we could not have the albatross, potential albatross investigation onto things that maybe don't benefit really from it. And so, the only other thing I would think of is if, in addressing a particular issue, you all know it's a flash point for the other side, you might include in your explanation a way to address the concerns of the other side. Say, we know that Mr. Dietderich and his team have identified certain issues and this is why we think -- how we could handle them, or avoid them or not avoid them because we think we can't avoid them, what whatever it is. Just so parties engage with each other in a meaningful way and so these submissions are a step forward. So Ms. VanLare, does that make sense to you? MS. VANLARE: That's perfect and very, very helpful. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Dietderich, does that make sense to you?

MR. DIETDERICH: Absolutely.

THE COURT: All right. So with that, what I will do is I will continue to adjourn the motions to the next time we get together. And I -- what I will do is I'm not -- my intent is to never surprise somebody by ruling. When you carry motions, sometimes you never quite know when is the judge going to rule. My intent will be that any time we're

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

getting together for status and to have these kinds of conversations, you're not going to get a ruling on the motions.

There may come a time when it is appropriate and necessary for me to do so, but I will always give people the heads up because again, I don't know where you are in negotiations and the last thing I want to do is have you all make progress and then surprise somebody with a ruling that undoes that progress.

So, that's my commitment to you. Obviously, you're all -- you both filed motions and there may come a time when you just say, Judge, this is time for you to rule and that's fine, but I promise not to surprise anybody with that and thus potentially undo all the good work that you've done.

So, my intent the next time we get together, whether it's the 2nd or the 4th, is not to rule. And again, if I'm going to make a ruling, I will pick a time and it'll be for that, specifically for that purpose. So just wanted to make sure everybody's on the same page.

And so, with that, Ms. VanLare, is there anything else to discuss on these two remaining agenda items that you think would be helpful?

MS. VANLARE: I don't believe so, Your Honor. Thank you.

|          | Page 22  |
|----------|--|
| 1        | THE COURT: All right. Mr. Dietderich, anything               |
| 2        | from you?  |
| 3        | MR. DIETDERICH: No, Your Honor. That's all very              |
| 4        | clear and thank you.   |
| 5        | THE COURT: All right. Thank you all very much                |
| 6        | for your continued discussions on what are very important    |
| 7        | issues to this case and to the FTX case. You all have        |
| 8        | enough challenging things to do, so I hope that we'll end up |
| 9        | at a place that regardless of what has to be resolved, makes |
| 10       | some progress and take at least some things off the list of  |
| 11       | topics to litigate over. So, we'll see how it goes. Thank    |
| 12       | you very much. Be well and see you soon.                     |
| 13       | MS. VANLARE: Thank you, Your Honor.                          |
| 14       | MR. DIETDERICH: Thank you, Your Honor.                       |
| 15       | (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at               |
| 16       | 2:37 PM)   |
| 17       |  |
| 18       |  |
| 19       |  |
| 20       |  |
| 21       |  |
| 22       |  |
| 23       |  |
| 24<br>25 |  |
| 20       |  |

|    | Pg 23 of 24                     |         |      |
|----|---------------------------------|---------|------|
|    |                                 | Page 23 |      |
| 1  | INDEX                           |         |      |
| 2  |                                 |         |      |
| 3  | RULINGS                         |         |      |
| 4  |                                 | Page    | Line |
| 5  | Compensation of ordinary course |         |      |
| 6  | professionals, granted          | 11      | 8    |
| 7  |                                 |         |      |
| 8  |                                 |         |      |
| 9  |                                 |         |      |
| 10 |                                 |         |      |
| 11 |                                 |         |      |
| 12 |                                 |         |      |
| 13 |                                 |         |      |
| 14 |                                 |         |      |
| 15 |                                 |         |      |
| 16 |                                 |         |      |
| 17 |                                 |         |      |
| 18 |                                 |         |      |
| 19 |                                 |         |      |
| 20 |                                 |         |      |
| 21 |                                 |         |      |
| 22 |                                 |         |      |
| 23 |                                 |         |      |
| 24 |                                 |         |      |
| 25 |                                 |         |      |

Page 24 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing 4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. 5 Songa M. deslarshi Hydl 6 7 8 Sonya Ledanski Hyde 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Veritext Legal Solutions 21 330 Old Country Road 22 Suite 300 23 Mineola, NY 11501 24 25 Date: July 26, 2023